

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 11 and 19 have been amended, and support is provided in the specification on page 1, line 25, through page 2, line 3, and page 2, lines 29-35. Claim 17 is amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 11-13, and 18-20 were rejected, under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by Harenberg, Jr. et al. (US 3,789,356). Claims 14-17 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Harenberg in view of Johnson (US 6,324,448). To the extent these rejections are deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Harenberg is not relevant art, with respect to the subject matter of claim 11, because this reference does not concern a non-precision approach landing, as recited in claim 11 and described on page 1, lines 16-24, of the present specification. Moreover, Harenberg does not disclose the approach modes recited in claim 11, which are directed to landing an aircraft and are either assisted approach modes (see specification page 1, lines 27-33) or a selected approach mode (see page 2, lines 1-3). Accordingly, Harenberg does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 11. Therefore,

allowance of claim 11 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

Claim 19 similarly recites the above-described features distinguishing method claim 11 from Harenberg, but with respect to an apparatus. For similar reasons that these features distinguish claim 11 from Harenberg, so too do they distinguish claim 19. Therefore, allowance of claim 19 and dependent claim 20 is warranted.

Also, Harenberg and Johnson, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the specific and numerous features recited in dependent claims 14-17. Although the Final Rejection proposes that Harenberg discloses the features of base claim 11 and that Johnson teaches the use of a satellite receiver (see Final Rejection section 10), the Final Rejection presents no discussion of motivation for combining the references to achieve the claimed invention or of why the applied references would have suggested the specific features recited in dependent claims 14-17. For example, there is no basis for the Final Rejection's conclusion that the combined teachings of the references suggest the features recited in claim 14 of selecting a first approach category when the following conditions are verified simultaneously:

(1) two flight management computers of the aircraft are functioning correctly;

(2) satellite positioning functions of two multimode landing assistance receivers of the aircraft are functioning correctly;

(3) at least two inertial reference systems of the aircraft, integrating aerodynamic data, are functioning correctly;

(4) at least one assisted approach mode function of at least one of the multimode landing assistance receivers is functioning correctly;

(5) an altitude value of the aircraft has a precision that is greater than a predetermined value;

(6) the integrity and precision of a position value of the aircraft are achieved; and

(7) a position of the aircraft, calculated by at least one of the flight management computers, and a position of the aircraft, received from a satellite positioning system, are consistent.

Regarding claim 15, there is no basis for the Final Rejection's conclusion that the teachings of the combined references suggest the recited features of selecting a second approach category when the following conditions are verified simultaneously:

(1) at least one flight management computer of the aircraft is functioning correctly;

(2) at least one inertial reference system of the aircraft, which integrates aerodynamic data, is functioning correctly;

(3) at least one assisted approach mode function of a multimode landing assistance receiver of the aircraft is functioning correctly; and

(4) a position value of the aircraft exhibits low uncertainty.

Regarding claim 16, there is no basis for the Final Rejection's conclusion that the applied references suggest the recited features of selecting a third approach category when the following conditions are verified simultaneously:

(1) at least one flight management computer of the aircraft is functioning correctly;

(2) at least one inertial reference system of the aircraft, which integrates aerodynamic data, is functioning correctly;

(3) at least one assisted approach mode function of a multimode landing assistance receiver of the aircraft is functioning correctly; and

(4) a position value of the aircraft exhibits high uncertainty.

Regarding claim 17, there is no basis for the Final Rejection's conclusion that the applied references suggest the recited features of selecting a fourth approach category when one of the following conditions A, B, C and D is verified:

A) two flight management computers of the aircraft are not functioning correctly;

B) two multimode landing assistance receivers of the aircraft are not functioning correctly;

C) three inertial reference systems of the aircraft, integrating aerodynamic data, are not functioning correctly; and

D) assisted approach mode functions of the two multimode landing assistance receivers are not functioning correctly.


Accordingly, it is submitted that the Final Rejection's conclusion regarding the obviousness of the claimed subject matter recited in claims 14-17 is unwarranted. Therefore, allowance of claims 14-17 is warranted for this independent reason.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone

the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James E. Ledbetter". The signature is stylized with a large initial "J" and a cursive "E".

James E. Ledbetter  
Registration No. 28,732

Date: June 8, 2005  
JEL/DWW/att

Attorney Docket No. L7307.04104  
STEVENS DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.  
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850  
P.O. Box 34387  
Washington, D.C. 20043-4387  
Telephone: (202) 785-0100  
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200